

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE <b>SEP 2009</b>		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED <b>00-00-2009 to 00-00-2009</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Implementing Integrated Testing</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>Department of Defense, Test Resource Management Center, 1225 S. Clark St., Ste. 1200, Arlington, VA, 22202</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release; distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>Same as Report (SAR)</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>2</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

## Implementing Integrated Testing

Christopher DiPetto

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, Acting Director, Developmental Test & Evaluation, Arlington, Virginia

**C**urrent Department of Defense (DoD) acquisition policy mandates the use of integrated testing. The policy not only makes economic sense but also has the potential to reduce risk, as early, integrated testing often involves more realistic operational scenarios than traditional developmental testing and therefore allows earlier discovery of operational failure modes. As more programs have attempted to implement the policy, however, they have encountered obstacles that have prevented them from fully realizing the benefits of integrated testing. Issues that present difficulty in integrated testing fall into three principal areas: sharing and access to data; shared control of test events; and overreaction by some observers to the test results. I believe the real obstacles to fully implementing integrated testing are mostly cultural and can be overcome with appropriate action by acquisition leaders.

DoD policy memos and guidance documents define what we mean by “integrated testing.” The Defense Acquisition Guidebook, Test and Evaluation (T&E) chapter (chapter 9) provides the formal definition and additional detail. The definition focuses on collaborative planning and execution of tests to provide a shared or common data set for independent evaluations and reporting. It is important to note that the definition is not “*integrated test and evaluation*” but “*integrated testing*.” Although the testing is planned and executed collaboratively by the contractor, government Developmental Test (DT) and Operational Test (OT) communities, the evaluations are performed independently to fulfill respective roles and missions.

The challenges regarding sharing and access to data seem to be associated largely with ensuring the pedigree of the data and proprietary issues with contractor data. As defined, integrated testing includes contractor testing and can result in claims of proprietary data rights. In order to share the data from contractor events, provisions for data access must be included in program contracts. The converse is also true if contractors are expected or allowed to use data collected during government test events. Discussing

data access issues up front, before the contract is signed, can set the expectation and allow for an equitable arrangement for obtaining access to contractor data. In order to assist programs with these types of T&E contractual matters, my office has produced a guide, “Incorporating Test and Evaluation into Department of Defense Acquisition Contracts” (<http://www.acq.osd.mil/sse/pg/guidance.html>).



Christopher DiPetto

Ensuring the pedigree of the data refers to understanding the configuration of the test asset and the actual test conditions under which each piece of data was obtained. While the primary purpose of integrated testing is to increase the value and efficiency of test events, the practice of sharing data also could result in a reduction in the acquisition timeline if we use shared data to satisfy multiple objectives. By infusing operationally relevant profiles and a mission perspective during integrated testing, and establishing and maintaining the data pedigree, much of the data needed by the Operational Test Agency (OTA) could be obtained before Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E). If the data collected during integrated testing is adequate, it could serve to shorten the dedicated OT&E phase.

The issue with shared control of test events appears to be acceptance and use of data captured from test events outside the evaluator’s sole control. It is easy to have confidence in data from a test you controlled. If tests are planned and conducted collaboratively, though, all stakeholders (both DT and OT) have control of the event, and all should be able to accept the data from the tests. The independence of the separate evaluation is not compromised by the fact that the source of the data was an integrated event.

Another issue is the potential overreaction by observers to test results. Many program managers view problems discovered during testing as bad news. Most understand that T&E results are important in maturing the system design through the systems engineering process, but reports of problems discovered in early testing could be misinterpreted by outside observers. The potential for these misunderstandings

creates a disincentive to stress the system early. It creates an incentive to perform DT in tightly scripted scenarios in order to demonstrate successful system operation. Unfortunately, this conduct merely postpones the discovery of operational failure modes, resulting in expensive rework and causing disruption to program schedules. We need the acquisition and user communities to realize that the product of T&E is knowledge about the system's capabilities and/or limitations, not problems. Testers and evaluators must develop knowledge that is relevant and timely for the decisions being made, and report results in a mission-oriented context. Ultimately, we need comprehensive knowledge from T&E results to assist in managing risks and better decision making.

Integrated testing holds a promise of greater testing efficiencies and improving the quality of the information provided to the decision makers. The challenge to the T&E community is to implement robust integrated testing and change the culture to fully realize the benefits to the acquisition process and ultimately to the warfighters. □

*CHRISTOPHER DiPETTO currently serves as the acting director, Developmental Test and Evaluation (DT&E)*

*within the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) with responsibility for oversight of 180+ major weapons systems developmental test and evaluation (T&E) programs and as the functional advisor for the T&E acquisition career field. Mr. DiPetto is the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L) on DT&E. He has over 29 years of experience in the Department of Defense with extensive experience in congressional matters, energy policy, acquisition, and T&E. Previous jobs in OSD included assignments as staff specialist for naval weapons and for strategic and tactical airlift programs. Mr. DiPetto served with the Naval Air Systems Command as a flight test manager, planning and executing Tomahawk flight tests. He began his career at the Navy's Pacific Missile Test Center as flight test engineer for surface and subsurface launched missile systems.*

*He earned a bachelor of science from the New York Institute of Technology in 1979. A graduate of the U.S. Naval Test Pilot School, he logged hours in a variety of U.S. Navy fixed and rotary wing aircraft. He is a 1994 graduate of the Harvard Kennedy School of Government, Senior Executive Fellows program; a 1993 graduate of the Defense Systems Management College's Program Management Course; and a Level III certified acquisition and T&E professional. E-mail: gordon.tillery.ctr@osd.mil*